



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,266	02/09/2004	Chi-Cheng Ju	3722-0176P	8567
2292 7590 02/21/2007 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			EXAMINER HSU, JONI	
			ART UNIT 2628	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/773,266	Applicant(s) JU ET AL.	
	Examiner Joni Hsu	Art Unit 2628	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Joni Hsu. (3) _____
 (2) Robert F. Gnuse. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 12 February 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-4 and 6-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: McGuinness, Vinekar.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


 ULKA CHAUHAN
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative pointed out differences between the present application and the cited references. Applicant's representative also mentioned that in the last remarks, it was argued that memory cells within the same row are often collectively referred to as a "page". The Examiner made a suggestion to amend the claims to include the limitation that a page refers to memory cells within the same row. Applicant's representative agreed to include this limitation. Upon receipt of the amendments, the Examiner will give the claims further consideration and perform an updated search.

INTERVIEW REQUEST FORM

Applicant's attorney requests a telephone interview with the examiner in regard to 10/773,266. The application has received a first non-final action after an RCE which is now due on Feb. 20, 2007 with a one-month extension of time. This is the third action in which the same rejection has been applied. Applicants believe that an interview will help in formulating a response to overcome the rejection and avoid the necessity for an appeal.

Applicants would be happy to receive any suggestions from the examiner to help overcome the rejection. Applicants also wish to point out differences over the cited references.

In regard to McGuinness, applicants believe that this arrangement is similar to that shown as prior art in Fig 2 of the present application. Applicants agree with the examiner that it does not show the memory page with two memory sections.

In regard to Vinekar, applicants believe that the arrangement of the data in the blocks differs from the present invention. In Vinekar, the columns are rearranged as rows and are arranged so as to be offset in adjacent columns. (See paragraph bridging cols 8 and 9). This allows consecutive data to occur along the diagonal. A data shuffler 410 is included for this purpose.

In the present application, consecutive even rows remain in the same order and likewise consecutive odd rows. Thus, the ordering of data is different in Vinekar. The independent claims refer to consecutive storage locations. Dependent claims 3, 11 and 14 further describe this concept. Applicants believe this concept is not shown in the references. However, applicants are willing to discuss language to emphasize this feature.

A telephone interview is requested for Monday Feb 12, 2007 at 2:00 pm. Applicant's representative is Robert F. Gnuse #27295; Birch Stewart, Kolasch and Birch; 703 205 8067.